

E 356  
.B2 U47

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005024390









# FORT McHENRY, MD.

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

## H. R. 11174

FOR PROVIDING FOR THE APPROPRIATION OF A SUM OF MONEY  
FOR THE ERECTION AT FORT McHENRY OF A MONUMENT AND  
FLAGSTAFF TO FRANCIS SCOTT KEY AND A MEMORIAL  
HALL TO THE DEFENDERS OF THE NATION IN THE  
WAR OF 1812, AND THE ERECTION OF A MONU-  
MENT UPON THE NORTH POINT BATTLE  
FIELD, AND FOR THE NECESSARY AL-  
TERATIONS IN THE BUILDINGS  
AND GROUNDS IN CONNEC-  
TION THEREWITH



WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

1914

E 35b

BR 1647

D. OF O.

AUG 25 1915

# FORT McHENRY, MD.

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1914.

## STATEMENT OF HON. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the bill which I desire to present to-day is H. R. 11174, providing for the appropriation of a sum of money for the erection at Fort McHenry, Md., of a monument and flagstaff to Francis Scott Key, and a memorial hall to the defenders of the Nation in the War of 1812; the erection of a monument upon the North Point Battlefield near Baltimore, and for the necessary alterations in the buildings and grounds of Fort McHenry.

I do not believe it necessary for me to read the entire bill, as the members of the committee each have a copy before them. But I ask that it be extended in the hearings.

A BILL Providing for the appropriation of a sum of money for the erection at Fort McHenry of a monument and flagstaff to Francis Scott Key and a memorial hall to the defenders of the Nation in the War of Eighteen hundred and twelve, and the erection of a monument upon the North Point battle field, and for the necessary alterations in the buildings and grounds in connection therewith.

Whereas a national patriotic celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of the Star-Spangled Banner, the defense of Fort McHenry, and the Battle of North Point will be held in the city of Baltimore in September, nineteen hundred and fourteen; and

Whereas these events are of great significance to the Nation in marking the climax of the defense of the country against invasion in the War of Eighteen hundred and twelve, the repulse of the force which had captured and despoiled the National Capital, and the origin of Key's matchless song; and

Whereas this blow to the invaders was soon followed by the treaty of Ghent, which established the commercial freedom of the United States as the final step in the achievement of national independence; and

Whereas in a celebration of this kind the National Government, in whose defense the battles were fought, ought to lend its aid so that the lessons of patriotism which it will convey may be impressed upon the people: Therefore

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there shall be erected at Fort McHenry, under the direction of the Secretary of War, a monument and flagstaff in honor of Francis Scott Key, the author of the Star-Spangled Banner.

SEC. 2. That there shall be erected at Fort McHenry, under the direction of the Secretary of War, a building to be known as Defenders' Memorial Hall, in memory of the men who successfully defended Fort McHenry at the time of the British attack on that fortification and of the other soldiers, sailors, and civilians who served their country in the War of Eighteen hundred and twelve.

SEC. 3. There shall be erected on the North Point battle field, upon the lot known as "Doctor Houck's Acre," a monument to the citizen soldiers of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, who participated in the successful defense of Baltimore against the attack of the British invading army in eighteen hundred and fourteen: *Provided, however,* That the State of Maryland shall first cede to Congress its right and title to said acre of land.

SEC. 4. That in the preparation of the plans and selection of sites for the said monuments, flagstaff, and memorial hall, and the execution of all work in connection therewith, the Secretary of War shall form a committee composed of the mayor of Baltimore, the chairman of the National Star-Spangled Banner Centennial, the

president of the Board of Park Commissioners of Baltimore, and two other persons to be designated by the Secretary of War, whose suggestions he shall invite, and with whom he may confer and consult: *Provided, however*, That the decision of the Secretary of War shall be final in all matters.

SEC. 5. That for the purpose of the erection of said monuments, flagstaff, and memorial hall, and for such changes in the grounds and buildings of Fort McHenry and North Point battle field as the Secretary of War may approve, the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the direction of the Secretary of War or such officer as he shall designate: *Provided*, That the money hereby appropriated may be drawn from time to time, as may be required in the progress of the work, upon requisition of the Secretary of War.

Baltimore is about to celebrate from the 6th day of September, 1914, until the 16th the centennial of the battles of North Point and Fort McHenry and the writing of the national anthem, the Star Spangled Banner, by Francis Scott Key. Our people want the Government to participate in this celebration for which other bills have been introduced and have been referred to the proper committees. However, no money has been granted by the Government under any bill except that this bill provides for putting the grounds at Fort McHenry in proper shape and the erection of these memorials. I do not propose myself to go into this matter fully as I have gentlemen here who are even more familiar with it than I am, and with the committee's leave I want to introduce to you his Honor, Mayor Preston, of Baltimore, who will speak to you upon this bill.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES H. PRESTON, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BALTIMORE.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I come with a twofold purpose. I thought, in the first place, that nothing would be more instructive to the committee and nothing would be so pleasant for us as to have the presence of the committee in Baltimore to examine and look over Fort McHenry and see its actual existing situation and condition. Therefore, I am here on behalf of the city of Baltimore to extend to the full committee, or to a subcommittee, as you gentlemen may prefer, an invitation to come to Baltimore some Saturday afternoon or some Saturday morning, and let us take you down to the fort in automobiles and have luncheon with me at the Maryland Club and then we will get back in the afternoon as early as you may desire. By this means you will see the situation. You will see how badly the Government has been taking care of this historic old fort, and you will see the need of some repairs and some renewals. You will also see the need of the construction of roads, and I hope you will also see the desirability of a permanent memorial to the days 100 years ago when the citizen soldiery of Baltimore saved the Nation, and brought about the treaty of Ghent two months later, and also brought about the continued existence of the great country which we now enjoy.

This is a matter of deep feeling with us in Baltimore and is a matter of deep interest to all Americans who love their country, and especially a matter of deep interest to the historical associations all over the country.

We are accompanied to-day, after the briefest kind of notice, by the most distinguished of our citizenship, the heads of our great trade organizations, the heads of our great civic bodies, and men connected



with our great mercantile establishments, our railroads, and our public authorities. For the purpose of having it in the notes, I would say that we have with us Mr. Albert Hughes, a leading merchant of Baltimore and vice president of the National Bank of Baltimore; Mr. Frank N. Hoen, of A. Hoen & Co., lithographers, and vice president of the German Bank; Mr. George R. Willis, a prominent lawyer and a director of the Second National Bank, who represents here the Clearing House of Baltimore; Dr. A. B. Bibbins, chairman of the executive committee of the 1914 celebration; Mr. Herbert Sheridan, in charge of transportation for the chamber of commerce; Maj. E. A. Walton, superintendent of transportation of the B. & O. Railroad; Mr. Robert E. Lee, representing the Federation of Labor; Mr. Hamilton G. Fant, of the C. D. Kenney Co.; Col. Jerome Joyce, ex-president National Hotel Association and a member of the committee of the 1914 celebration; Mr. Rufus M. Gibbs, president of the board of trade, our most distinguished business organization, comprising in its membership all of the other trade organizations and business organizations of our city and port; Mr. Philip D. Heusler and Mr. Joseph F. Heinz, of the Emerson Drug Co.; and myself, as the mayor of Baltimore; and lastly, though not least by any means, Representatives Covington, Smith, Coady, and Linthicum.

Fort McHenry, gentlemen, occupies a singular and an unusual position in our harbor. It is in the midst of our city and shipping, and transportation is all around it. It consists of 38 acres of land, the most valuable single piece of land in the possession of the War Department or the Government. This old, abandoned piece of land in the very heart of our city is worth probably \$1,000,000, surrounded by shipping, in immediate touch with the great railroad terminals, and the Government has allowed it to lie fallow, to grow up in weeds and briars and sedge, with one man in charge of that great military reservation representing the Government.

Now, gentlemen, I am going to come to the question which I consider the very gist of the matter, and that is this: We have just been before the Committee on Military Affairs and we said to them: "We want to have Mr. Roosevelt, we want to have Mr. Taft, and we want to have Mr. Wilson come to Baltimore in September." Those gentlemen have all accepted the invitation. We are going to have the governors of the 18 States of the Union at that time come to Baltimore with their militia and their troops. They are going to be in and around Fort McHenry. It does not seem to me in keeping with the dignity of our Government that this old field shall lie fallow in its present condition.

We appeared before the Military Affairs Committee and said, "Gentlemen, fix this place up, put it in charge of soldiery, put it in condition for ordinary observation on the part of visitors to our harbor and our city, and do not let it be a disgrace, not only to Baltimore city, but to the Government of our country." They said to us, "Gentlemen, we have no money to do that with." The Congress is very zealous of military expenditures on the part of the Army, and we have no money we can appropriate for that purpose. The best thing we can do is to let you take care of it yourselves." I conferred with our city authorities, and what was the result? The result was that the Government said to us, "Now, gentlemen, we have this old, abandoned, historic fort with its many associations, lying in the

heart of your harbor; we have no troops there, we are not occupying it in any sense, and only have a keeper there. But if you want to take charge of it and use it as part of your park system we will let you do that as tenants at will."

Mr. SHERLEY. You do not think that is a burden upon you, do you, to give you the use of a million dollars' worth of property in the heart of your city for park purposes?

Mr. PRESTON. I was coming to that question in a moment, sir. Unless this committee takes some action, we will have to maintain it in its present condition. We are building \$2,000,000 worth of streets in that section. We are building the Key Highway, Covington Street, and spending that amount of money in streets to give access to the fort. If we had a long lease on this property, if we were going to use it for any purpose which would be advantageous from any standpoint other than a sentimental standpoint, of course we could make money and rent it——

Mr. SHERLEY (interposing). But is it not of value as a park?

Mr. PRESTON. But this is the proposition as I see it, Mr. Sherley, and I stated this before the Committee on Military Affairs when I was met with that objection. How would you feel if a brother of yours were to say to you, "I have an old, dilapidated house on Fifth Avenue in New York, or on Madison Avenue in Baltimore; you can take it as a tenant at will and live in it"——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Suppose, Mr. Mayor, I were clamoring to have him spend a lot of money on it for my benefit and he were to say to me, "If you want to use that house go ahead and use it and fix it up to suit yourself?"

Mr. PRESTON. I do not think you would do that. In order to put Fort McHenry in proper condition, to put in roads and put the buildings in habitable condition, would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. I do not know how many—one, two, or three hundred thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. But when you would have a magnificent park of 38 acres without any capital investment.

Mr. PRESTON. But with a maintenance investment which we are ready and willing to undertake; but we are not ready and willing to spend \$100,000 or \$200,000 on Government property, with the Government having the right to do what it probably will do, and what Gen. Aleshire says he is ready to do, take it over the next year, when our capital investment would be lost.

This is the situation, my friends, if you had a friend who offered you a dilapidated house to live in free, and the occupation of that house involved an expenditure of a large sum of money in permanent betterments, what would you say to him? You would say to him, "I do not want it." We are not asking for Fort McHenry. We are asking the Government to handle Fort McHenry as it handles other Government reservations, as it handles the reservation on the Hudson River at West Point, and as it handles the reservation at Pensacola, Fla.

The CHAIRMAN. What has the Government done at West Point?

Mr. PRESTON. I only quote you what Gen. Aleshire has said, and I refer you to his remarks before the Military Affairs Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to know what the Government has done at West Point to put it in the same category.

Mr. PRESTON. You have a Government reservation there which is not needed for military purposes on which I understand has been spent \$150,000.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not familiar with any such expenditure and I am pretty familiar with West Point.

Mr. PRESTON. I am not very familiar with West Point, but I am very familiar with what took place before the Military Affairs Committee and it may be I can find you exactly what was said there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you refer to Constitution Island?

Mr. PRESTON. Fort Bentham. Mr. Linthicum will find the quotation.

We are here to ask two things, broadly: one is that the property which you propose to turn over to us, as tenants at will, be put in reasonable habitable condition, and after that it shall cost the Government nothing to maintain it, with the right in the Government to come the next day and say we want the property back. Secondly, we are asking the Government for patriotic reasons, in view of the work that the citizen soldiery did in the salvation of this Nation in 1814, in view of the 100 years centenary of the writing of the Star Spangled Banner and the bombardment of Fort McHenry and the battle at North Point, to erect a permanent memorial to the work done by the defenders there, as Baltimore City is to-day building a monument to Key, to be unveiled next year, and building a monument to Col. Armistead which is to be unveiled next September. We are asking the Government to take some steps, not in contributing to this celebration, but to putting its own property, lying in the midst of the city of Baltimore, in reasonable, decent, presentable condition.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, Mr. Mayor, you have already passed through the House of Representatives a bill permitting you to take possession of this property, to use your phrase, as tenants at will. Why was it not made a condition to that transfer at the time the bill was put through the House that the Government should spend a certain amount of money on it? There was not anything said about that. There was such a provision, as I now recall, in the bill, and it was afterwards stricken out in order to get the bill through. After getting the bill through with that provision stricken out, are you gentlemen in a position to come here in all fairness and ask us in another bill to put it back in?

Mr. COVINGTON. Will you permit me to interrupt you to answer the gentleman from Kentucky? Mr. Sherley is as shrewd a parliamentarian as there is in this House—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). That bill had a paragraph appropriating \$10,000 for putting the work in condition, and the Committee on Military Affairs in reporting the bill reported it with an amendment striking out that paragraph, and that amendment was agreed to by the House and the bill was passed.

Mr. COVINGTON. I want to say this: I happened to be in the House at that time. It was not a bill I had charge of, because I do not live in that section of the State, but the gentleman from Kentucky and the distinguished chairman of this committee are two of the shrewdest parliamentarians in the House of Representatives. They very well know that that bill was of a character that would only turn up in two ways on the calendar. It either must be called up by unanimous consent on one of the unanimous-consent days or it had to take

its chances when the Committee on Military Affairs was reached on a Calendar Wednesday. The peculiar position of the Committee on Military Affairs as to Calendar Wednesdays was such that we do not know when it may ever be reached again on a Calendar Wednesday, and the gentleman from New York knows very well that on two successive Mondays the very astute minority leader, Mr. Mann, practically demanded that that provision should be eliminated from the bill before he would yield and give his unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Committee on Military Affairs declined to report the bill carrying any appropriation, and reported it with an amendment striking the appropriation out.

Mr. COVINGTON. That is true.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, take your own statement, Mr. Covington. You also know parliamentary law, and you know perfectly well that the bill never could have been considered or passed if it had carried a burden upon the Treasury. Now, the point I make is——

Mr. COVINGTON (interposing). That bill could not; certainly not, Mr. Sherley.

Mr. SHERLEY. I mean that particular bill. Now, you come in and get a concession on certain conditions, one of them being that there shall be no burden upon the Government.

Mr. COVINGTON. Surely.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, having gotten that concession, you undertake from that vantage ground to come and ask us for an appropriation.

Mr. COVINGTON. Yes; and I very well recall another famous fight, in which we happened to be on the same side of the proposition, when this condition occurred - a condition, by the way, of no more serious moment than the present one that his honor the mayor of Baltimore represents, when the rather equivocal celebration at San Francisco was under consideration. There was with great *éclat* proclaimed before this House by Mr. Kahn and other gentlemen the very same substantive proposition you refer to, and the only way that bill was ever gotten up was by a disclaimer that they would ever come to this Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. Are you referring to the deception practiced upon the House on that occasion as a precedent for this?

Mr. COVINGTON. No, sir; I do not think there was deception practiced upon the House, but when the time came and the exposition was an established fact and a memorial was to be established to an event in American history no more momentous than the memorial to the defenders at Fort McHenry, which, after all, crystallized the emancipation of this Nation in its trade fight with Great Britain—when the question of the Panama-Pacific Exposition was before us and the honor of the American Government subsequently became at stake, I have a very vivid recollection that the gentleman from Kentucky, among others of us, was quite willing in the last analysis to see one-half million dollars appropriated under circumstances surrounding that Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco that were no more momentous than this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. What happened in that connection was this: They asked for \$2,000,000——

Mr. COVINGTON (interposing). And we all, you and Mr. Sherley and myself, very gracefully yielded to an appropriation of one-half million



dollars. I did not mean to interpose any remarks just at this time, but I was so familiar with other circumstances that I wanted to reply to the statements made.

The CHAIRMAN. Congress recommended an appropriation of a half a million dollars for a Government exhibit to be installed in a building to be furnished by the Panama Exposition Co.

Mr. COVINGTON. Yes. Now, there is just one other thought that occurs to me at this time, and I am sure that none of the gentlemen on this committee, with their knowledge of history, will for one moment gainsay this: The circumstances surrounding the Knoxville Exposition are in no sense comparable with the events that took place at Fort McHenry.

Mr. SHERLEY. And I did my best to prevent that appropriation.

Mr. COVINGTON. I understand you did, Mr. Sherley, but some did not, and when this House has gone on record to the extent of appropriating \$100,000 to perpetuate that rather equivocal celebration at Knoxville, I think it would not be going out of its way to grant this request.

The CHAIRMAN. There are four things proposed in this bill: First, the erection of a flagstaff and monument in honor of Francis Scott Key; second, the erection of a building to be known as Defenders' Memorial Hall; third, the erection upon a lot known as "Dr. Houck's Acre" a monument to the citizen soldiers of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania; and fourth, the expenditure of a certain amount of money to put Fort McHenry in usable shape. I understand, Mr. Mayor, you stated it will take \$100,000 or \$200,000 to do that?

Mr. PRESTON. The bill, of course, gentlemen, is subject entirely to your approval, and I am simply naming what appears to us to be fair and just, but, of course, we will be satisfied with any findings the committee will make.

The CHAIRMAN. I simply want to get some information. I understood you to say it would take \$100,000 or \$200,000 to properly fit up Fort McHenry for use as a park?

Mr. PRESTON. I would think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill as introduced in the House by Mr. Linthicum providing for the use of Fort McHenry carried an appropriation of \$10,000 to put it in condition to be used as a park by the city of Baltimore.

Mr. PRESTON. I do not know anything about that.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not, either. It was in the bill proposed by Mr. Linthicum.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Let me answer that question. I want to say that the mayor was not even cognizant of that provision in the bill. I took the matter up with the War Department and told them I thought certain buildings and roads there ought to be repaired when they turned it over, and I asked them whether they would have any objection to a small appropriation to put the place in shape, and I told them at that time about having a bill before this committee to provide for the general repairing of the fort and putting it in shape, and they said they had not any objection to a small appropriation to take care of the immediate repair of the buildings; but that was stricken out, as you know, by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. An appropriation of \$500,000 is requested in this bill and I desire some information as to the amount of money re-

quired for the purposes specified in the bill; how much for the monument and flagstaff, how much for the memorial hall, how much for the monument on North Point Battlefield, and how much to put the fort in the condition you say it should be in?

Mr. PRESTON. This is the proposition we are putting before you, broadly, Mr. Chairman. There are, I imagine, several miles of roads, one road that should lead around the entire water front. Now, it has been our experience that it costs in Maryland to make country roads \$12,000 or \$15,000 a mile. If you build streets or a good road in the city it costs a great deal more. That is largely conjectural; but I call your attention to the fact that the money is to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War or his representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mayor, that is not what we wish to know. Here is a bill proposing four different things and asking an appropriation of \$500,000 to enable them to be done. This committee wants information as to how much is to be expended upon each one of the proposed projects.

Mr. PRESTON. Will you let Mr. Bibbins answer that question in a moment, when I shall have concluded?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PRESTON. In my judgment, gentlemen, the bill lays down two broad requests, either of which or both this committee can decline. Of course, the committee can say, "You can get nothing from the Government except this old field, which you can fix up and spend your own money on and which we can take back the next day if we want it." I do not think that is a reasonable proposition. I do not think it is the way the matter ought to be put up to Baltimore city. However, the committee can do another thing. There are two things we are asking to be done: One is that a memorial to the war and to the events of 1814 be established by a permanent memorial, and the other thing is that the property be put into tenantable condition. Not that you shall pay the cost of maintenance, but before you turn it over to Baltimore city to handle you do not require us to put betterments and improvements on your property which we may lose in a day or a week or a month or a year and have our capital account entirely wiped out. We can not face our people with any such expectation.

Mr. BARTLETT. For how long a time would you like to have the property?

Mr. PRESTON. I do not know, sir. If the city of Baltimore spent \$100,000 on the property, as a reasonable matter I should say ten or twenty or thirty years. The Government would not give it to us on any such terms, because the Government may need it day after to-morrow for war purposes; it may need it for the storage of supplies. We are building a railroad reaching there for their own purposes.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the Government needed it for war purposes and if it were private property the Government would take it and use it.

Mr. PRESTON. But in this case they would not reimburse the city.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, let us get at the facts: There is no probability on earth that the Government will ever use this property for war purposes. I happen to be the chairman of the subcommittee on fortifications, and from the standpoint of fortifications, it is clear out

of the question. If you people should expend \$100,000 for the improvement of these grounds, would not that improvement be of value to the city of Baltimore, even if the property should come back into the hands of the Federal Government? Is there any property that the Federal Government now has in the way of grounds around lighthouses or grounds around hospitals or grounds around any other institution of the Government, except in the case of arsenals, that is not always open to the use of the public, and would not whatever park improvements you made there—and that is what you would expend that \$100,000 for—always be of value to the city of Baltimore?

Mr. PRESTON. You want my answer to that: Let me suggest that it is not only possible that the Government will require the grounds back, but it is extremely probable that they will require them back at any moment.

Mr. SHERLEY. For what purpose?

Mr. PRESTON. For War Department purposes. I say that because that statement was made by Gen. Aleshire.

The CHAIRMAN. If that be the fact, then this committee would not be justified in expending money for park improvements. That expenditure would not be justified if there is any likelihood of the property being taken for War Department purposes.

Mr. PRESTON. We are not asking you to spend money to maintain this park.

Mr. SHERLEY. But you are asking us to fix it up. Now, you are asking us to fix it up upon the theory that you can not afford to do it, because its use for the purpose that you would fix it up for is so uncertain as to not warrant the city of Baltimore in making the expenditure. Now, as has been suggested by the chairman, if it is uncertain for the city of Baltimore it is equally uncertain for the Federal Government—

Mr. PRESTON (interposing). Not for fixing it up, because that would be necessary whether you authorize it for park purposes or whether you use it for military purposes. For whatever purpose you may use it, you must maintain your reservation. You must fix those old buildings up.

Mr. SHERLEY. You do not expect that property to be used for military purposes, do you? If you do, you are the only man who does. Of course, I do not mean that offensively, but no man who understands the technical requirements for modern fortifications does expect that property to be so used. They would not think of using that as a fort.

Mr. PRESTON. Of course, I do not know. I hope it will be a long time before the Government will use anything for war purposes. But you ought to use it for something; you ought to use that property for something, and not let it lie there, as an old field.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The buildings are in need of repair.

Mr. PRESTON. The buildings are in need of repair, and you ought to do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is the Federal Government under obligations to do more with its property than a private individual?

Mr. PRESTON. But a private individual would do it. The Federal Government has 38 acres of land there in the heart of the harbor, and we have not been able to obtain enough land on which to erect

an immigration station for the Government. The Government had to go down and carve a corner off the Fort McHenry reservation for its immigration station. This property ought not to be abandoned; that is bad business; it is bad business, whether it is the Government's or a private individual's. It is bad business to abandon it, and it should be utilized for some purpose.

Mr. SHERLEY. You do not want to create a use for it just in order to utilize it, do you?

Mr. PRESTON. You maintain your parks here in Washington—you have beautiful parks—and you should fix up this reservation at Baltimore. Is there any reason why the city of Baltimore, which pours into the coffers of the Nation \$10,000,000 annually, should not have some consideration?

Mr. SHERLEY. On that theory my city should have a great deal of consideration, because she contributes so much in the way of internal-revenue taxes. There is nothing in that argument, because even if Baltimore pays more in taxes to the Government than any other place it is simply the medium through which it is paid.

Mr. PRESTON. That is true; but still, the medium is entitled to some consideration.

Mr. SHERLEY. The thing before the committee is a different proposition. I agree with you that it is desirable to have, instead of a weed-grown place, a place that can be of use to your city, and because of that fact we are willing for you to use it for that purpose. Now, your people are unduly concerned lest Uncle Sam will take it back. If you thought that Uncle Sam was going to use this property inside of a year, you would not have been concerned about getting it transferred at all. Now, the question is whether the Federal Government or the city of Baltimore should expend the money for the necessary improvements in order that it may be used for park purposes, and inasmuch as the city of Baltimore will derive the direct benefit it seems to me that they should bear the direct burden of the improvements.

Mr. PRESTON. Of course, you are to determine this question; but I do not agree with you. I do not think it is reasonable for the Federal Government to expect the city to put permanent improvement on the property, especially in view of the fact that the Government has the expectation of using it.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the Government has no such expectation.

Mr. PRESTON. Of course, I can go no further than to say that that statement was made by the Quartermaster General of the Army.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to have his statement read. I would like to know for what purpose he proposes to use it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Gen. Aleshire made that statement.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us have exactly what he said.

Mr. PRESTON. I have not that record.

Mr. LINTHICUM. This is not only a question of making roads, but there are a lot of valuable buildings there going to ruin, and we think they ought to be put in order for use. Gen. Aleshire said that he wanted the buildings close along the water front. He wants to use some of those buildings for the shipment of supplies by water as well as by rail, and for that purpose he consented that \$10,000 be inserted in the bill for the purpose of putting those buildings in order and to take care of them at present. There is a hospital building there that



you could not put up for less than about \$50,000, and there are three or four other buildings right along the water front, and you could not put any of them up for less than \$10,000 apiece. Those buildings we want to keep in order, and we think the Government ought to be willing to put them in order. After they are put in order we will take care of them. We are in a peculiar position in Baltimore. Our railways pay us a certain percentage of their gross income, and the city uses that money for the purpose of taking care of park property. They do not use any part of that money in the purchase of property, but they use it for the purpose of keeping up property. Therefore if this property is put in order, the city will be in a good position to take care of it; but we do think that the Federal Government ought to put its buildings in order when they turn them over to us. The bill does not rest entirely on that; but we are asking for certain memorials, and Dr. Bibbins, who is chairman of the executive committee, will give you an account of them. It is the proposition of the people of Baltimore, after these buildings are put in order, to take care of them, and it is also their proposition to take care of the memorials that are asked.

Mr. BARTLETT. What do you mean by taking care of them?

Mr. LINTHICUM. By keeping them in repair.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do you mean the Government buildings?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes, sir; we will take care of the whole business without any expense to the Federal Government at all. But we think you ought to turn them over to us in good repair. The property should be put in order before it is turned over to us. The roads are washed out, and we propose to take care of them out of our railway fund. I might say that that is due to the foresight of our city authorities, that a percentage of the gross income of the railways shall be paid to the city for the purpose of taking care of its parks.

Mr. BARTLETT. You have suggested that the Government may perhaps still have to use this property for Government purposes?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes, sir. Gen. Aleshire expects to use three or four of the buildings on the water front within a short time for the purpose of shipping Army supplies out by water and by rail.

The CHAIRMAN. What he would use, then, would be the buildings, and that would not interfere with your use of the land for park purposes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not think so, so far as the grounds are concerned. I do not think they will ever use that, but if war should take place, the buildings will be found to be advantageous. There are barracks there that would accommodate perhaps 1,000 soldiers in time of war. They are located right there at deep water, and soldiers and supplies could be sent readily from that place. But if the buildings are allowed to rot and go to ruin, it will be a big loss to the Government, because they could not be replaced for perhaps less than \$250,000 or \$300,000.

Mr. SHERLEY. Eliminating from our consideration the question of the monuments and the celebration of this occasion, and considering the question of improvements, pure and simple, is it your idea that the Government should simply put these buildings in proper condition?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes, sir; and the roads.

Mr. SHERLEY. What do you mean by the roads?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think there are 38 acres——

Mr. SHERLEY (interposing). What I want to know is whether you are not confusing your request for the improvement of these buildings that you say the Government may use for warehouse purposes——

Mr. LINTHICUM (interposing). And hospital.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is there a hospital there?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes, sir; there is a hospital building there which would cost, perhaps, \$50,000.

Mr. SHERLEY. You do not think the Government will maintain a hospital there, do you?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No, sir; but I think the Government ought to take care of the building.

Mr. SHERLEY. What do you mean by building roads?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Just putting the roads already there in good order.

Mr. PRESTON. There is one new road project. There are 38 acres of land, and a road running through it. There is also projected a road around the sea wall. Here [indicating] is a plat of the property.

Mr. SHERLEY. What is the property worth?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not believe that you could get the Government to sell that property. The patriotic people of this country would not consent to such a thing. I am quite sure that if I tried it I would have to move out of Baltimore, and the mayor has suggested that if he undertook it, he would have to move out.

I would like now for you to hear Dr. Bibbins, who can explain the cost of the memorial, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have some statement in regard to that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mayor Preston, does the city contemplate using any of the buildings on these grounds?

Mr. PRESTON. No, sir; I think it is thought if we could get the memorial some of these buildings, which are in a moribund condition, will be torn down. All the other buildings will be utilized by the Quartermaster Department of the United States Army.

Mr. MONDELL. You say they will be used by the Army?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, sir; they will be and are now.

Mr. MONDELL. Are they using them now?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, sir; they are used for the storage of quartermaster supplies and will be continued to be used for that purpose to an increased extent. The city of Baltimore is building a railroad down to it, and it was a condition of the grant by the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee that this railroad spur should be run in there.

Mr. MONDELL. What is this hospital building that has been spoken of utilized for?

Mr. PRESTON. Nothing; that is vacant.

Mr. MONDELL. Are the barracks and quarters occupied?

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, no. There is only one man there on this whole tract representing the Government.

Mr. MONDELL. But I understood you to say that the Quartermaster Department was using these buildings?

Mr. PRESTON. They store supplies in them and move them away. They have things stored there now and are going to extend that use very much.

Mr. MONDELL. That is, they are utilizing some of the buildings as storehouses?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, sir; they are utilizing some of the barracks, I think, for storage purposes. There are 25 or 30 buildings and I would say that most of them are vacant. Most of them are in very bad condition—the papering is falling off and the plastering also.

Mr. MONDELL. Under the bill that passed the House the other day, was it contemplated that the city would utilize some of these buildings for any purpose?

Mr. PRESTON. No, sir. We have no use for them at all. We did not want the property. It is going to be an expense to us: but we asked that this sore spot, this scandal, be removed, and to let us do it ourselves in some way.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Preston, the War Department has available during the present year for the purpose of keeping such buildings and grounds, \$2,073,600, which is placed at the disposal of the War Department to be expended upon such buildings and such grounds as they think essential for the proper conduct of the Government's business. This committee could not undertake to appropriate money to supplement such an appropriation. Who is the gentleman you say is to speak as to the cost of the several projects?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Bibbins.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. A. B. BIBBINS, EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL STAR SPANGLED BANNER CENTENNIAL COM- MISSION.

Mr. BIBBINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the question that has just been raised regarding the sale of Fort McHenry makes me feel that we need about three or four minutes of history here, and with your permission I want to mention a few historical points. These events include the successful defense of Baltimore immediately following the capture and burning of Washington. As soon as the news of the repulse of the enemy at Baltimore reached the commissioners at Ghent, the American commissioners, after weary months of discouragement, were at once able to secure acceptable terms of peace. This happy result brought our second war for independence to a close, and we were guaranteed commercial as well as political freedom, and were at last the free Nation we had declared ourselves to be 38 years before. The strategic importance of the victory at Baltimore can only be realized when it is remembered that it was the avowed plan of the British after the capture of Baltimore to march north from the head of the bay, unite forces with their army from Canada in the heart of the country, cut off New England, and once again reduce us to dependent colonies. With the Capitol burned, the Government helpless and bankrupt, a vast section opposed to the war and favoring separation, one can but feel that the surrender of Baltimore might well have been fatal to the Nation and the loss of everything for which the Revolutionary patriots had striven. Let me for a moment recall the part which Baltimore and Maryland had taken in this war before the final climax was reached.

Early in the conflict, when the bankrupt General Government called for a loan of \$16,000,000 from the then 18 states, Maryland appropriated \$450,000, and Baltimore merchants subscribed

\$3,000,000—together, more than one-fifth of the whole, and this despite the fact that Baltimore's commerce had fallen from \$14,000,000 to \$238,000. These loans became the basis of our State and municipal debts. When Baltimore discovered that none of this was available for her own protection, she pluckily raised \$1,000,000 more for local defense, and it was because of this generous sacrifice, and the extra security it made possible, that she was able to turn the tide of invasion and save not only herself, but the Nation.

Gentlemen, it is not necessary for us to emphasize the importance of the conservation of America's patriotic shrines. Here are two, whose importance stand out boldly in the annals of American freedom. Here were fought the last two battles which sealed that freedom, and ushered in a century of peace, and an era of progress and achievement unparalleled in history, culminating in the Panama Canal. These shrines lie at the gateway of one of our great eastern ports, midway between north and south, from which point they are well calculated to spread their message of peace and good will to all nations flocking to our shores. We are asking but a trifle as the Nation's tribute to these shrines, to the end that the world may be reassured that this great country is "too big and too powerful"—as the President has recently said in another connection—not to cherish the memory of her defenders and their needs. We do not believe we need to do more than state our cause to so intelligent and farsighted a body of citizens as compose this committee.

If another word of persuasion is needed, permit me to add that the British Government long ago, honored the memory of brave Gen. Ross, who lost the victory we won, by a handsome monument at Halifax, a cenotaph in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and the title and estate of Bladensburg for his family. In addition to this, the British Government will shortly celebrate, in a very elaborate way, the century of peace with the United States, insured by the Treaty of Ghent, which we think we can claim was first insured by the victories at Baltimore. "The land of the free, and the home of the brave," must certainly not be outdone by the mother country, or any other, in cherishing the memory of her defenders, nor permit others to appropriate the laurels which belong to her own fair brow. In a word, we believe that Congress should, if need be, lavish its funds upon such shrines as Fort McHenry and North Point, because of their far-reaching significance.

Now, regarding the matter of how it is proposed to commemorate this event, we have in mind the following use of the money which is asked:

First. A Defenders' Memorial Hall, or a National Temple of Peace, if you prefer to call it by that name, to cost \$300,000. This should be a steel fire-proof structure to occupy the pentagonal inclosure, as suggested by Gen. Aleshire, within the Star Fort, with colonaded superstructure and dome. Upon its walls at one end Pinkney's terse declaration of war, and upon the other Key's glowing words of deliverance and peace. Between these, mural paintings of the bombardment and North Point battle scenes, and other notable events associated with this war. Here will be collected all the trophies, relics, and souvenirs of both wars for independence, in which our region abounds, but which are so rapidly disappearing.



Second, a monument to Francis Scott Key, in the flag bastion of the fort, from which the Star Spangled Banner waved to him its message of triumph—this to cost \$100,000.

Third. A suitable steel flag staff with ornamental bronze base, and summit of symbolic design to replace the present wooden structure upon the very spot where stood the flagstaff of 1814, this to cost \$5,000. We have in mind something like what you may see in front of the Union Station here in Washington.

Fourth. A monument at North Point battlefield, where an acre of ground was given for the purpose, and a cornerstone laid 75 years ago—this to be erected to the citizen soldiers of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, who checked the enemy at this point, and fought the last conflict between the British and Americans, before peace was secured—this to cost \$70,000.

Fifth. For putting the buildings and ground of Fort McHenry and North Point in proper shape to receive these proposed memorial structures, \$25,000 will be required.

The city of Baltimore has made provision for the purchase and restoration of the old town residence of the signer of the Declaration, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, in commemoration of the centenary of national independence. It is investing millions in the "Key Highway" as a suitable approach to Fort McHenry. It has also in preparation a monument to our Baltimore commander of the fort, Col. Armistead, but we are sure you will agree with us that Congress should erect the memorial to Key and the flag, the Defenders Memorial Hall, and the Citizen Soldiers' Monument to the men who preserved us as a nation.

I thank you for your attention.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you say was to be expended on the monument to the flag or to Francis Scott Key?

Mr. BIBBINS. \$100,000 for the Key monument.

The CHAIRMAN. And how much for the memorial hall?

Mr. BIBBINS. For that \$300,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And how much for the monument on the North Point Battlefield?

Mr. BIBBINS. For that, \$70,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That would leave \$30,000 for all the incidentals and fixing up the grounds?

Mr. BIBBINS. That would be \$5,000 for the flagstaff and \$25,000 to put these grounds in condition.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be \$25,000?

Mr. BIBBINS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That would leave \$25,000 for the incidental expenses. What is the memorial hall to be? What is proposed? This does not mean anything unless it is explained.

Mr. BIBBINS. In the first place, it would be a hall for patriotic gatherings from all parts of the country. We have a great many meetings of that sort in Baltimore, and I can not conceive anything more appropriate on a battle field of that sort than this proposed memorial would be.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the purpose in the minds of those who suggested this? What size or capacity is contemplated?

Mr. BIBBINS. Gen. Aleshire suggested what I mentioned, that it should be just inside of the pentagonal inclosure within the Star Fort.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know what was in the minds of those who suggested this type of memorial. I want to know what is to be the capacity of it. Those who originated this plan must have had something in their minds. There must have been something in their minds on which this estimate of \$300,000 was based. That is the information we wish.

Mr. BIBBINS. The best answer I can make to that is that a building to fill that space would cost in the neighborhood of \$300,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the dimensions of it?

Mr. BIBBINS. I suppose the diameter of that space would be 150 or 175 feet.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not sure that I understand what you mean. This map shows a rectangular space marked "For memorial hall," and I presume from your statement that you mean for it to be inside the fort.

Mr. BIBBINS. Yes, sir. After conferring with some members of the Military Commission, we changed it to meet their suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN. What is to be the capacity of the building?

Mr. BIBBINS. I suppose it would hold 2,000 or 3,000 people.

Mr. SHERLEY. Do you think you have room enough inside that fort for the memorial hall and still leave proper air space around?

Mr. BIBBINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The fort walls do not extend very high.

Mr. BIBBINS. The suggestion was to have a basement a little above the terrace and the superstructure above that.

Mr. SHERLEY. What you are proposing to do is to put a rectangular building in that space.

Mr. BIBBINS. No, sir; it will be pentagonal.

Mr. SHERLEY. It would come up higher than the walls of the fort, so that practically the usable part of the building would look out over the ramparts of the fort?

Mr. BIBBINS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. \$25,000 is the amount that would remain for the rehabilitation of these existing buildings and to repair the roads?

Mr. BIBBINS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is all it is contemplated will be required?

Mr. BIBBINS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why can not the city of Baltimore do that? This contemplates an expenditure of \$500,000, and of that amount it is proposed to expend \$25,000 for the purpose of putting these buildings and grounds in suitable condition.

Mr. BIBBINS. The proposed memorial hall would contain: Relics of the War of 1812 and of the Revolutionary War; mural paintings of the following subjects: Battle of North Point, Defense of Fort McHenry, Treaty of Ghent, and Treaty of Paris; replica (or original) Star-Spangled Banner; portrayals of War of 1812 and of the Revolutionary War; busts; library of War of 1812 and Revolutionary War literature. It could be used as a meeting place for patriotic and other conventions, and the basement could be used as an armory.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like for you to hear Mr. Rufus M. Gibbs, the president of the board of trade.

**STATEMENT OF MR. RUFUS M. GIBBS, PRESIDENT BOARD OF  
TRADE, BALTIMORE, MD.**

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I will not keep you long. If I did not have some other reason than the thought, as a citizen of Baltimore, that anything we could get out of the public purse was that much profit, I would not be here at all. I do naturally feel as a citizen of Baltimore that we want this money, and as a citizen of the United States I feel that the United States ought to give it to us. My reasons for that view are based solely upon the score of patriotism. We have armies of unemployed, made up chiefly of unemployables, coming here to Washington; socialism, anarchism, and all the other isms are rampant, and to-day mobs in the chief cities of the country are invading the churches and profaning the sanctity of the church. Now, if there is anything at this time that is going to act as a bulwark against all these new thoughts and reckless ideas it is patriotism, and I think that this Government should do everything that it can possibly do and that it should seize every opportunity offered to foster and encourage any movement of a proper nature that is going to cultivate the idea of patriotism and spread it broadcast throughout the land. We have millions of new immigrants in this country who have no conception of patriotism, as patriotism was understood by our forefathers. Now, if there is any one thing or any one mark in our history which shines out conspicuously, it consists of the acts and deeds in connection with this proposed celebration of the Battle of North Point and the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner. It is an inspiration in the same way that Lexington, Saratoga, and Yorktown are inspirations, and we are going to celebrate it. We want to impress it upon the country as a whole, and I really think, gentlemen, that this question of increasing the patriotism of our Nation is going to do a great deal toward holding things in check until wise counsels and prudent judgment can devise ways and means for settling the great economic questions that are confronting us to-day. That is the chief argument that presents itself to me. I do not know anything about the bills that have been presented in Congress, and I can not answer any questions in regard to them, but I do feel that the solidarity of the family is dependent largely upon the respect in which the children of the family hold their parents, and that the solidarity and integrity of the Nation is largely dependent upon the love and respect in which the people of the nation hold its history and traditions.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Robert E. Lee, as representative of the labor organizations of Baltimore, and secretary of the centennial commission, will now address you.

**STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT E. LEE, SECRETARY OF THE  
CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.**

Mr. LEE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I feel that Fort McHenry is as important from the historical point of view as any other spot in the United States. We feel that we have been patient and have suffered long, and that we have not asked the Government with the emphasis that we ought to have put upon our application to do anything for us in the way of spending money to



preserve the history of our country that is associated with Fort McHenry. We ourselves are going to spend several hundred thousand dollars in having a celebration which will be national, and we hope international, in scope. We feel that if there ever was a time when the Government should look with favor upon the question, not so much as an investment, but from the standpoint of patriotic ideas and sentiments, the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of North Point and the writing of the Star Spangled Banner would be that time. At that time, when we will have people from all over the country visiting our city, we hope we will not have to say to them: "This is Fort McHenry, about which your children have read in school, and about which they are taught; this is the place where the national anthem which they sing and reverence was written. This reservation is the property of the Government, and it is sadly neglected. It is a broomsage field, and the Government has not done anything for it." I do not want to have to say that to the people who visit our community, either native or naturalized, and there will be there people from foreign lands, perhaps; but we want to say to them: "This is the place where the national anthem was written, and it blossoms like the rose; the Government takes good care of it, and we are proud in our possession of it."

Now, what has been done for other historic places in the United States? Boston has been very liberally looked after in all matters of historical importance. They have done some of it themselves, through the local government, but the National Government has also done more there than it has done for Baltimore and Maryland. Other places in the country have been liberally treated by the Congress of the United States. We say that we are not here to prove to you that in dollars and cents this will pay you; we are not here to figure out as to whether or not it will be a good investment for the Government, but we are here to say to you that this is a historic place and that it deserves at your hands the same treatment that other historic places have received. We want to say that we do not care what kind of buildings your architects decide that we ought to have. We do not care whether you say it should be a square building or a round building, or whether it should be a high building or a low building. We are perfectly willing to take your views or those of the Government's, architects upon that subject, because we know that when the Government of the United States spends its money for the construction of buildings, it is going to get full returns for its investment. We are willing to take your judgment as to the character of the buildings. We will, of course, suggest what we would like to have, but if our suggestions do not meet your approval, Congress will not regard them, but everything will be done to the entire satisfaction of the National Government. The buildings will be put to whatever purpose Congress may determine. We want a memorail, which from the national and historical point of view, will be in keeping with the dignity of the occasion or event we are to celebrate, and we are perfectly satisfied that Congress shall determine what it shall be and to what use it shall be put. We want to erect a permanent memorial in commemoration of those battles and the writing of the Star Spangled Banner.

The CHAIRMAN. To what use would this memorial building be put?  
Mr. LEE. To whatever use you may say.



The CHAIRMAN. We are not making any suggestions about that. You are asking for a memorial hall.

Mr. LEE. We would be glad, if we should secure this appropriation, to have the plans prepared and submitted to you or to the proper Federal authorities for approval. Our main idea was that we wanted the memorial, and we do not know whether it shall be a flagstaff or building——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You are asking for a building to cost \$300,000, and I have asked you if you could state to what use such a building would be put.

Mr. LEE. I can only state to what possible uses the Government might be able to put it. I could imagine its use for a number of purposes. I can imagine the use of the buildings for soldiers——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I am speaking of the memorial hall; it would not be erected for that purpose.

Mr. LEE. We will use it for whatever purpose you say.

The CHAIRMAN. You are requesting a \$300,000 building, and this committee is endeavoring to ascertain what is in the minds of those who propose that building as to the use it should be put to.

Mr. LEE. What was in the minds of the people who suggested the memorial hall was that it should be a building in which historical societies and patriotic societies could hold conventions.

The CHAIRMAN. How often would the historical societies in various parts of the country be likely to go to Fort McHenry for the purpose of holding their conventions?

Mr. LEE. There might be statues in there and there might be paintings in there. They might hold their conventions in that hall. It could be used just as the Daughters of the American Revolution use their building here in Washington. They use it every year for their convention, and then in between times they use it for other things in connection with the business in which they are engaged. We figure that we can do the same thing in Baltimore. If the Government can tell us what use should be made of the hall, we will be perfectly willing to abide the will of Congress in the matter. The thing that we want to impress upon your committee is that we want the Federal Government to become interested in Fort McHenry, because Fort McHenry is important enough for the Government to be interested in it. We think that we have had to fight in this cause long enough; we have even had to ask the Government not to dispose of that property to private enterprise. We have had to come over to Congress a number of times when Senator Rayner was living and ask you to see to it that it was not abandoned altogether. This reservation has been sadly neglected; the buildings have become dilapidated, and it is beginning to look worse than these yellow clay hills outside of Washington. We think the national Government ought to have a greater pride in a place where such an important historical event occurred. We think that the Federal Government on its own initiative should see that an important place of that kind is properly preserved and handed down to generations yet unborn as a place that they can point to and say, "Here was written the national anthem, the Star Spangled Banner." That is the way we feel about it.

We want the Government, the National Government, to be identified with this spot. The National Government should be identified

with this memorial to Francis Scott Key, the author of the Star Spangled Banner. We are here to appeal to you in the name of sentiment and patriotism; we are here to urge in the name of patriotism that the Federal Government should be identified with this memorial; we are not here to prove that this will be a profitable investment to the Government in dollars and cents, or that you could not spend the money elsewhere more profitably in building coast defenses, etc. We know that it is not suited for a fort; we know that it can not be used for fortification purposes, but we do know that the Government, by paying proper attention to this historic spot, will inculcate the idea and principle of patriotism in the minds of those who see it. Why, for instance, do people journey to that place in Texas simply to see the little barracks where Houston and his immortal comrades defended the State? Why do people go down to see the old cathedrals and institutions where the people worshiped? Why do they spend their money journeying to such places? It is because these places have been made immortal by the deeds that were wrought there. That is why we want the people of this country to come to Fort McHenry. We want the people to come there and see that our Government has not neglected this spot. It is now a barren tract; it is now an old broom sage field. Yet, the National Government is identified with the place where the Star Spangled Banner was written and where some of the most important events of the War of 1812 took place. I have not surveyed that ground, and I do not know what the dimensions of the building would be. I am not an architect or a builder, but I know all that information can be obtained, and we are willing to rely upon the wisdom of the Government in working those details out.

Mr. GIBBS. You have asked several times about the use to which the memorial hall could be put. I think that the word "memorial" well expresses the use to which it could be put. I think the name "Memorial Hall" indicates the use. Perhaps it does not indicate the practical use, but it indicates the same sort of use that the Washington monument is, as I see it from the window here. It is an inspiration.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not believe that a hall is simply something to look at?

Mr. GIBBS. That is true in part, but the hall itself would still be used as a storehouse for interesting relics of both the War of 1812 and the Revolutionary War.

The CHAIRMAN. Where would they come from?

Mr. GIBBS. By gathering them from private sources. I am sure there are many people in Baltimore who have valuable relics of both wars.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to use it as a museum?

Mr. GIBBS. I am simply suggesting a use to which it could be put.

The CHAIRMAN. You are asking us to appropriate \$300,000 for a hall which is to be called "The Defenders' Memorial Hall," or "The National Temple of Peace." Now, it is not unreasonable in us to ask what the originators of this plan had in mind.

Mr. GIBBS. The thought in my own mind was that a memorial hall could be put to a very useful purpose, but the most useful purpose of all is the fact that it is in commemoration of the soldiers who gave their lives for their country 100 years ago.

Mr. SHERLEY. Here is the principal question that confronts this committee: I think the committee has a proper appreciation of the value of memorials and the desirability of properly inculcating patriotic sentiment in the minds of the people, but we also have an appreciation of the perhaps exalted view taken by all of us touching the things that are in our immediate neighborhood. Now, if we undertook to build \$300,000 memorials at every fort that has played some important part in the history of America, we would have to appropriate tremendous sums of money. This committee must not only consider the desirability of doing a particular thing, but the desirability of doing it in comparison with other things that may also be desirable, because we have presented to us proposals from all over America, and it is very easy for one to make a very patriotic and eloquent speech touching the commemoration of many events at many places. I can on a moment's notice recite to you perhaps 50 places that all of us would agree abstractly are proper places to be commemorated and preserved, and yet it is perfectly apparent that Congress can not say yes to every proposal of that kind that is presented.

Mr. GIBBS. There is no other fort that so well deserves commemoration——

Mr. SHERLEY (interposing). There are a number of forts that have such claims; to make you a direct answer, there are a number of forts that have more claim to such recognition by reason of their historic associations.

Mr. GIBBS. We appreciate very much the responsibility of the committee, and we also realize how easy it is for anyone to ask you for money on the general assumption that the public purse is unlimited——

Mr. BARTLETT (interposing). It is not unlimited, but from the way demands are made upon it it would seem that there is an impression that it is unlimited.

Mr. GIBBS. Well, gentlemen, we are here and we have tried to state our case to you. We have given you to the best of our ability our reason for asking for this money. In the first place, gentlemen, we are perfectly serious in feeling that we are asking for something that we have a right to ask for—not that we have a right to demand it, but a right to ask for it, and we hope that your committee is going to see the matter eventually in our way.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think your zeal is commendable, but I think that, inasmuch as I particularly have been shooting questions at you very freely, I should bring to your consideration a little of the other side of the case——

Mr. GIBBS (interposing). And it is a quite interesting presentation of it that you have made. Your committee has suggested things that had not occurred to me before; but, superimposed above everything else, I am impressed with the thought that if patriotism is something that should be encouraged and if it is worth while to spend something in its encouragement, here is a good opportunity to spend some money for that purpose. If you do not feel that way and if, in the wisdom of this committee, this request can not be granted, we can only gracefully accept your judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is it necessary to have four different monuments? Why would not one monument answer the entire purpose?



Mr. GIBBS. Because there are half a dozen roads leading to the same terminal.

The CHAIRMAN. You are asking for a memorial hall, a monument to Francis Scott Key, a flagstaff, and also a monument at the North Point battle field. It seems to me that you are asking for a great many things at once.

Mr. BORLAND. I was not here at the beginning of the hearings and I want to know whether it is proposed that any part of this be done by the city of Baltimore.

Mr. GIBBS. The city of Baltimore is undertaking a big celebration.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We have two other gentlemen here to be heard. I now present to you Mr. Frank N. Hoen, the vice president of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association.

**STATEMENT OF MR. FRANK M. HOEN, VICE PRESIDENT OF  
THE MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,  
BALTIMORE, MD.**

Mr. HOEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I will not take up much of your time. I simply wish to say that as vice president of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Baltimore I have devoted a good deal of my time to working out a proper schedule for the demonstration to be held in our city in September, and I can assure you that our merchants and manufacturers are heartily behind this whole proposition. They will spend millions of dollars to make this demonstration a notable affair for the country. I am surprised that you gentlemen should be disposed to go into the suggestion of cutting down the appropriation that we have asked for. I served as a representative of our State on the commission to the World's Fair at Chicago, to the St. Louis Exposition, to the Panama Exposition, and the Southern Exposition at Charleston, and for all of those expositions this Government made large appropriations. The city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland have never come and asked for any specific appropriation from Congress for any such purpose. I say to you that the citizens of Baltimore will spend not less than \$5,000,000 in carrying out the program that we have in view, and it does seem small for our committee to come here and ask for a mere \$500,000—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). In what way will the citizens of Baltimore spend \$5,000,000?

Mr. HOEN. I mean exactly what I say.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, tell us about it.

Mr. HOEN. For example, we are arranging for the first day's celebration an industrial parade, and we have every assurance that there will be more than 500 floats in that parade.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be advertising the industries of Baltimore.

Mr. HOEN. It does, but that means the expenditure of money. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. will have 5,000 men in line, and it will be one of the biggest things that railroad ever did. There will be millions of dollars spent on that celebration. Now, I want to say this, that the idea of coming here for this appropriation came up in this way: To have this celebration without participation by the Federal Government would be like giving the play of Hamlet without having Hamlet in the play.



Mr. BARTLETT. The trouble is that you are proposing here a great many things that do not seem to be illustrative of patriotism nor commemorative of the event.

Mr. HOEN. So far as the Government's participation in this matter is concerned, it can for itself determine the form of the memorial to commemorate the writing of the Star Spangled Banner. Whether that shall take the shape of a memorial hall, whether it shall be a monument, or making an appropriation for converting this reservation into one of the beauty spots of the world for the city of Baltimore to take care of afterwards, is a matter for you gentlemen to say; but we think that it is right for us to come here and ask you, in view of what the city is doing and in view of what our citizens are doing, for an appropriation of \$500,000 to be expended as this bill provides.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In answer to Judge Bartlett's suggestion, I want to call the attention of the committee to another memorial. I was on the committee to visit St. Louis to participate in the dedication of the Jefferson Memorial Hall. That, in my opinion, is a splendid memorial. They were gathering together there all of the historical relics they could get and placing them in that hall. Then, they had another part where they held lectures and conventions. They had a statue of Jefferson, and that memorial was one of the most beautiful things I have ever seen. I think it a most beautiful as well as useful memorial. In this case, I had in mind the thought that we could gather together the relics of the War of 1812 and of the Revolutionary War, and we might also have a hall there in which conventions—not large conventions, of course, but a hall in which patriotic conventions could be held. We have thought that would be a most appropriate memorial—a hall standing above the ramparts of old Fort McHenry.

I now present to you Mr. Herbert Sheridan, the president of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. HERBERT SHERIDAN, PRESIDENT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have but a few words to say. I want to remind you of the very cordial invitation that his honor the mayor gave this committee to come over to Baltimore and see this spot. If that is done, there will be a very much better acquaintance on the part of the committee with the place itself. A visit by the committee to this historical spot will give them an acquaintance with the subject that will be of great aid to them. The celebration of this event is a matter of great interest and one that appeals not only to the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland for support, but we are satisfied that if the country at large were aware of this occasion, without a dissenting voice in any quarter, the entire country would be behind us in our request for this assistance at the hands of the Federal Government. Now, as to the particular marking of this spot by means of a memorial building, that, in the minds of the committee, seemed to be more appropriate than a monument of some kind.

The CHAIRMAN. But you propose a monument in addition.

Mr. SHERIDAN. I know, but I am speaking of the hall——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). That is why I asked about the hall. You were asking for a hall and the monument is in addition.

Mr. SHERIDAN. It seemed to be most fitting to the committee that there should be a statue of Francis Scott Key, the author of the American anthem. My own experience, gathered through a residence in Columbus as to the utility of a memorial building, might be of some value. The people of that city thought that it would be a most suitable way to revere the memory of the soldiers and sailors. It is now used as a committee room by the Grand Army posts, and as a place for the gathering of conventions, for public meetings, for lecture courses, and for various events of musical societies. It is the common meeting place not only for the city of Columbus, but for the State at large, and used as such it has been greatly enjoyed. It has been very feasible and most valuable as a memorial.

I thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any one else who desires to be heard?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No, sir.

I thank the committee for its kindness in giving us this extended hearing, but I particularly hope that you will come and see this old fort; let us show you just what we are asking of you, and how important it is.









WERT  
BOOKBINDING  
Grantville, Pa  
Jan - Feb 1989  
We're Quality Bound

